

Lower Duwamish Waterway Group

Port of Seattle | City of Seattle | King County | The Boeing Company

AGENDA FOR FOOD WEB MODELING MEETING, MARCH 25, 2003

- ◆ Model Objective
 - ◆ Key question for model to address: Establish relationship between concentrations of hydrophobic organic compound (e.g., PCB) concentrations in fish tissues (i.e., English sole and sculpin) and sediment
 - ◆ Model will not address: Relationships between chemical concentrations in fish and upper-trophic level receptors, such as otter and humans. These relationships will be addressed through standard risk dose equations.
- ◆ LDW System
 - ◆ Five mile, engineered estuarine waterway with large tidal range and low bedload
 - ◆ Sediment contamination believed to be largely historic
 - ◆ Fish to model are English sole (consumes benthic invertebrates; home range unknown but may be similar to size of site) and Pacific Staghorn sculpin (consumes both benthic invertebrates and fish; home range unknown but likely smaller than size of overall site)
 - ◆ Available data: 965 surface sediment samples and fewer tissue samples (several fish, benthic invertebrates, crab, mussels). Water quality has been extensively modeled.
- ◆ Food Web Model Options
 - ◆ Models used at other Superfund PCB sites
 - ◆ Most likely options include steady state model (e.g., Gobas 1993) or an empirically based model (using BSAFs for benthic invertebrate and tissue ratios to relate concentrations in benthic invertebrates and fish).
 - ◆ Other options? Pros and cons.
- ◆ Critical Issues with Model
 - ◆ What input data are required for each approach?
 - ◆ What are the most sensitive parameters for each approach?



- ♦ How should the water component of a model such as Gobas (1993) be addressed? Options include setting $C_w = 0$ or using King County Water Quality Assessment data. Run both ways?
 - ♦ What benthic invertebrate tissue data are needed? Will market basket data (i.e., composite of benthic invertebrates according to abundance at sites) be sufficient?
 - ♦ What approaches are preferred to address uncertainties in fish home ranges?
 - ♦ Are stomach content data needed for English sole or sculpin? LDWG believes EPA is collecting these data for sculpin as a function of fish size.
 - ♦ Should the food web model be run on an Aroclors vs. congener-specific basis? What are the pros and cons of each approach relative to final uncertainties?
-
- ♦ Influence on Phase 2
 - ♦ How will the modeling approach selected influence the final sediment and tissue sampling plans in the Phase 2 work plan?

Lower Duwamish Waterway
Food Web Modeling Mtg
3/25/03

Name	Affiliation	phone	e-mail
Allison Hiltner	EPA	(206) 553-2140	hiltner.allison@epa.gov
Enika Hoffman	EPA	360-753-0546	hoffman.enika@epa.gov
Gary Prescoe	Strophilus Env/Cib	360-385-9977	gprescoe@olympus.net
Lawrence McCrone	Exponent	(425) 519-8743	mccrone.l@exponent.com
Rick Bodishbaugh	Exponent	425-519-8707	rbodishr@exponent.com
MIKE GLEASON	BOEING	206 290-6576	Michael.J.gleason@boeing.com
Skip Fox	Boeing	206 851 5991	skip.fox@boeing.com
Debra Williston	King County	206-296-7822	debra.williston@metrokc.gov
Deb Lester	King County	206 296 8325	deborah.lester@metrokc.gov
JEFF STERN	"	206-296-6447	JEFF.STERN@METROKC
KATH GOWDARDSON	Windward	206 577-1283	KATHG@WINDWARDENV.COM
Jenee CoHon	Windward	206-577-1286	jeneec@windwardenv.com
Lisa Saban	Windward	206-577-1288	lisa.s@windwardenv.com
mike Johns	Windward	206-577-1280	mikej@windwardenv.com
Low KIRKINSON	EMT	206-553-2115	KIRKINSON.Low@EMT-WA.gov
Bruce Duncan	EPA	206-553-8086	duncan.bruce@epa.gov
"Bob" Jay Hotchkiss	Port of Seattle	206-728-3192	hotchkiss.de@portseattle.org
Ben Cope	EPA	206-553-1442	Cope.Ben@epa.gov
Joe Goulet	EPA	206-553-6692	Goulet.Joe@epa.gov
Dana Davoli	EPA	206-553-2135	Davoli.Dana@epa.gov
Ted Turk	SAIC	425-482-3324	turkt@saic.com
Phone Folks			
Todd Bridges	Corps	601-634-3626	
Lawrence Burkhard	EPA	218-529-5164	
Tom Grier	Ecology	360-407-7536	